

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**

**REMARKS**

Initially, in the Office Action dated March 30, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-9, 16, 20, 21, 24, 25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WO 98/11744 (Kotola et al.). Claims 2 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotola et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,523,062 (Bridgman et al.). Claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotola et al. in view of Applicant's own admission as prior art as recorded in "Background of the Invention". Claims 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotola et al. and Bridgman et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,321 (Coan et al.). Claims 22, 23, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotola et al. in view of Coan et al. Claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By the present response, Applicants have submitted new claims 29-35 for consideration by the Examiner and submit that these claims do not contain any prohibited new matter. Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 21 and 25 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-35 remain pending in the present application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner indicating that claim 19 contains allowable subject matter. This claim has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims as new claim 35.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-9, 16, 20, 21, 24, 25 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kotola et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Kotola et al. discloses Internet service in a digital mobile communication network by means of short message service. The short message service is connected to the Internet network and uses the HTML, HTTP, and TCP/IP protocols towards the Internet network. Short messages are transferred between the short message service center and mobile stations in the usually manner. The user submits to the service center a short message containing an identifier indicating the desired WWW page. The short message center or the other equipment sets up a connection to the desired WWW server via the Internet network, receives therefrom the WWW page, and stores it. The relevant part is separated from the WWW page and is sent to the mobile station in a short message. The relevant part of a WWW page may be identified by a predetermined criterion, common to all subscribers, or it may be based on a criterion received from the mobile station, such as a key word. The mobile station processes the received short message in the usual manner and displays it to the user.

Regarding claims 1, 21, 25 and new claim 35. Applicants submit that Kotola et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, transferring resource related information from a mobile terminal to another mobile terminal that includes connecting the first mobile terminal to an external communication network for accessing a resource, selecting, by a user of the first mobile terminal, information relating to the resource that the user wishes to send to the second mobile terminal, or transferring the resource related information to the second mobile terminal over a negotiated communication connection between the first and second mobile terminals. Kotola et al. discloses a terminal sending a URL to a server in the form of a short message service where the server then extracts the URL, sends it to the Internet to get the content in the specific URL. The server then sends the content to the terminal in response to the request. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to transferring information between two wireless or mobile terminals. Kotola et al. discloses transferring information from a mobile terminal to a server. Further, according to the limitations in the present application, a first mobile terminal accesses a resource, selects information related to the resource desired to be sent to a second mobile terminal then sends the selected information to the second mobile terminal. The second mobile terminal has not requested the information, as is disclosed in Kotola et al. Kotola et al. requires a request for certain content.

The Examiner asserts that Kotola et al. discloses transferring resource related information from a first terminal to a second terminal at page 10, lines 10-33.

However, as noted previously, Kotola et al. discloses transferring information between a short message service center and a mobile station. This is not transferring resource related information from a first mobile terminal to a second mobile terminal, as recited in the claims of the present application. The short message service center disclosed in Kotola et al. is not a mobile terminal as recited in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 3-9, 16, 20, 24, 28 and new claims 29-34, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 21 and 25 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims. For example, Applicants submit that Kotola et al. does not disclose or suggest where the negotiation of the connection includes specifying a bearer to be used in transporting the information to the second wireless terminal, or where the bearer is specified in accordance with a predetermined user preference, or selecting the second mobile terminal based on a list providing association between terminal contact information and recipient information.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Kotola et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 3-9, 16, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28 and new claims 29-35 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 2 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotola et al. in view of Bridgman et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Bridgman et al. discloses facilitating network delivery of Wireless Markup Language (WML) decks (or decks in similar notations) to memory-constrained client devices such as wireless application protocol devices, by applying a deck-reduction process to the decks, such as the decks being reduced by fragmentation into new decks of a manageable size. No loss of deck content occurs in this fragmentation process. The cards of the original deck are grouped into new sub-decks where each sub-deck is no larger than a particular maximum deck size.

Applicants submit that claims 2 and 10-12 are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Bridgman et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kotola et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the second terminal is a client of a server connected to the external network and the information facilitates access to an external network resource by the second terminal, or where the connection comprises an infrared link or a low power radio frequency link.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in

the combination of each of claims 2 and 10-12 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotola et al. in view of Applicants' Background of the Invention. Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Applicants' Background of the Invention does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kotola et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where both the wireless terminals are using a wireless application protocol and the resource information comprises a wireless application protocol deck.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 17 and 18 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotola et al., Bridgman et al. and further in view of Coan et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Coan et al. discloses a service message, including a device application identifier and a bearer service indicator, being generated and sent to a wireless

communications device. As a result, data can be transmitted between a server and a wireless device over a selected bearer service.

Applicants submit that claims 14 and 15 are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that neither Bridgman et al. nor Coan et al. overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kotola et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where both wireless terminals are using a WAP and the request is sent to a second terminal using a connection list push command.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 14 and 15 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 22, 23, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotola et al. in view of Coan et al. Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 21 and 25 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that Coan et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Kotola et al. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where the controller



operates in accordance with a wireless application protocol or is arranged to receive the resource related information via a push command.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 22, 23, 26 and 27 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-35 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 367.40027X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



---

Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb  
(703) 312-6600